

Attachment A to the Declaration of Shannon Wheatman



Shannon R. Wheatman, Ph.D.

President

Kinsella Media, LLC

2001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 300

Washington, DC 20006

2010 – Present

Dr. Wheatman specializes in designing, developing, analyzing, and implementing large-scale legal notification plans. She is a court-recognized expert who provides testimony on the best notice practicable. Dr. Wheatman began her class action career in 2000 at the Federal Judicial Center where she was instrumental in the development of model notices to satisfy the plain language amendment to Rule 23. Her plain language expertise was advanced by her education, including her doctoral dissertation on plain language drafting of class action notice and her master's thesis on comprehension of jury instructions. Dr. Wheatman has been involved in over 350 class actions. Her selected case experience includes:

Antitrust

Allen v. Dairy Farmers of America, Inc., No. 5:09-CV-00230-CR (D. Vt.).

Blessing v. Sirius XM Radio, Inc., No. 09-CV-10035 HB (S.D.N.Y.).

Brookshire Bros. v. Chiquita, No. 05-CIV-21962 (S.D. Fla.).

Cipro Cases I and II, No. 4154 and No. 4220 (Super. Ct. Cal.).

In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 2311 (E.D. Mich.).

In re Dynamic Random Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig., MDL No. 1486 (N.D. Cal.).

In re Flonase Antitrust Litig., No. 08-CV-3301 (E.D. Pa.).

In re Metoprolol Succinate End-Payor Antitrust Litig., No. 06-CV-71 (D. De.).

In re NYC Bus Tour Antitrust Litig., No. 13-CV-0711 (S.D. N.Y.).

In re Online DVD Rental Antitrust Litig., MDL No. 2029 (N.D. Cal.).

In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig., MDL No. 1827 (N.D. Cal.).

In re Transpacific Passenger Air Trans. Antitrust Litig., MDL No. 1913 (N.D. Cal.)

Roos v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc., No. CGC 04-0436205 (Super. Ct. Cal.).

Sweetwater Valley Farm, Inc. v. Dean Foods, No. 2:07-CV-208 (E.D. Tenn.).

The Shane Grp., Inc., v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, No. 2:10-CV-14360 (D. Minn.).

Consumer and Product Liability

Abbott v. Lennox Industries, Inc., No.16-2011-CA-010656 (4th Jud. Cir. Ct., Dade Cty. Fla.).

Beringer v. Certegy Check Servs., Inc., No. 8:07-CV-1434-T-23TGW (M.D. Fla.) (data breach).

Chaudhri v. Osram Sylvania, Inc., No. 2:11-CV-05504 (D.N.J.) (false advertising).

CSS, Inc. v. FiberNet, L.L.C., No. 07-C-401 (Cir. Ct. W. Va.) (telecommunications).

Donovan v. Philip Morris USA, Inc., No. 06-12234 NG (D. Mass.) (medical monitoring).

FLA Card Servs., N.A. v. Camastro, No. 09-C-233 (Cir. Ct. W.Va.) (credit card arbitration).

George v. Uponor Corp., No. 12-249 (D. Minn.) (defective product).

Glazer v. Whirlpool Corp., No. 1:08-WP-65001 (N.D. Ohio)(defective product).

Grays Harbor v. Carrier Corp., No. 05-CIV-21962 (W.D. Wash.) (defective product).

In re Building Materials Corp. of America Asphalt Roofing Shingle Prods. Liab. Litig., No. 8:11- 02000 (D.S.C.) (roofing shingles).

In re Checking Account Overdraft Litig., MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.) (JP Morgan, U.S. Bank, BOA settlements; overdraft fees).

In re Enfamil LIPIL Mktg. & Sales Practs. Litig., No. 11-MD-02222 (S.D. Fla.) (false advertising).

In re M3Power Razor System Mktg. & Sales Practs. Litig., MDL No. 1704 (D. Mass.) (false advertising).

In re Netflix Privacy Litig., No. 5:11-CV-00379 (N.D. Cal.) (privacy).

In re Pharm. Industry Average Wholesale Price Litig., MDL No. 1456 (D. Mass.) (pharmaceutical).

In re SCBA Liquidation, Inc., f/k/a Second Chance Body Armor, Inc., No. 04-12515 (Bankr. W.D. Mich.) (defective product).

In re Sony Gaming Networks & Customer Data Security Breach Litig., No. 11-MD-2258 (S.D. Cal.) (data breach).

In re Target Corp. Customer Data Security Breach Litig., MDL No. 14-2522 (D. Minn) (data breach).

In re Toyota Motor Corp. Unintended Acceleration Mktg, Sales Practs, & Prods. Litig., No. 8:10ML2151 (C.D. Cal.) (unintended acceleration).

In re Vioxx Products Liab. Litig., No. 05-MD-01657 (E.D. La) (pharmaceutical).



In re Wachovia Corp. "Pick-a-Payment" Mortgage Mktg & Sales Practs. Litig., No. M:09-CV-2015 (N.D. Cal.) (negative amortization).

In re Wirsbo Non-F1807 Yellow Brass Fittings, No. 2:08-CV-1223 (D. Nev.) (defective product).

Keilholtz v. Lennox Hearth Prods., No. 08-CV-00836 (N.D. Cal.) (defective product).

Kramer v. B2Mobile, LLC, No. 10-CV-02722 (N.D. Cal.) (TCPA).

Lee v. Carter Reed Co., L.L.C., No. UNN-L-39690-04 (N.J. Super. Ct.) (false advertising).

Mirakay v. Dakota Growers Pasta Co., Inc., No. 13-CV-4229 (D.N.J.) (false advertising).

Palace v. DaimlerChrysler, No. 01-CH-13168 (Cir. Ct. Ill.) (defective product).

Rowe v. UniCare Life & Health Ins. Co., No. 09-CV-02286 (N.D. Ill.) (data breach).

Spillman v. Domino's Pizza, No. 10-349 (M.D. La.) (robo-call).

Trammell v. Barbara's Bakery, Inc., No. 3:12-CV-02664 (N.D. Cal.) (false advertising).

Wolph v. Acer America Corp., No. 09-CV-01314 (N.D. Cal.) (false advertising).

Environmental/Property

Allen v. Monsanto Co., No. 041465 and *Carter v. Monsanto Co.*, No. 00-C-300 (Cir. Ct. W. Va.) (dioxin release).

Angel v. U.S. Tire Recovery, No. 06-C-855 (Cir. Ct. W.Va.) (tire fire).

Cather v. Seneca-Upshur Petroleum Inc., No. 1:09-CV-00139 (N.D. W.Va.) (oil & gas rights).

Ed Broome, Inc. v. XTO Energy, Inc., No. 1:09-CV-147 (N.D. W.Va.) (oil & gas rights).

In re Katrina Canal Breaches Litig., No. 05-4182 (E.D. La.) (Hurricanes Katrina and Rita).

In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico on April 20, 2010, MDL No. 2179 (E.D. La.) (BP oil spill).

Jones v. Dominion Transmission Inc., No. 2:06-CV-00671 (S.D. W.Va.) (oil & gas rights).

Thomas v. A. Wilbert & Sons, LLC, No. 55,127 (18th Jud. Dist. Ct., Iberville Parish) (vinyl chloride water contamination).

Government

Cobell v. Salazar, No. 1:96-CV-01285 (D. D.C.), Depts. of Interior and Treasury.

Countrywide Mortgage Settlement, Department of Justice.



Iovate Settlement, Federal Trade Commission.

National Mortgage Settlement, Attorneys General.

Walgreens Settlement, Federal Trade Commission.

Insurance

Beasley v. Hartford Ins. Co. of the Midwest, No. CV-2005-58-1 (Cir. Ct. Ark.) (homeowners insurance).

Bond v. Am. Family Ins. Co., No. CV-06-01249 (D. Ariz) (property insurance).

Burgess v. Farmers Ins. Co., No. 2001-292 (Dist. Ct. Okla.) (homeowners insurance).

Campbell v. First Am. Title Ins. Co., No. 2:08-CV-311-GZS (D. Me.) (title insurance).

DesPortes v. ERJ Ins. Co., No. SU2004-CV-3564 (Ga. Super. Ct.) (credit premium insurance).

Fogel v. Farmers Grp., Inc., No. BC300142 (Super. Ct. Cal.)(management exchange fees).

Guidry v. Am. Public Life Ins. Co., No. 2008-3465 (14th Jud. Dist. Ct.) (cancer insurance).

Gunderson v. F.A. Richard & Assocs., Inc., No. 2004-2417-D. (14th Jud. D. Ct. La.) (PPO).

Johnson v. Progressive Casualty Ins., Co., No. CV-2003-513 (Cir. Ct. Ark.) (automobile insurance).

McFadden v. Progressive Preferred, No. 09-CV-002886 (Ct. C.P. Ohio) (UM/UIM).

Orrill v. Louisiana Citizens Fair Plan, No. 05-11720 (Civ. Dist. Ct., Orleans Parish) (Hurricane Katrina property insurance).

Press v. Louisiana Citizens Fair Plan Prop. Ins. Co., No. 06-5530 (Civ. Dist. Ct., Orleans Parish) (Hurricane Katrina property insurance).

Purdy v. MGA Ins. Co., No. D412-CV-2012-298 (4th Jud. Ct. N. Mex.) (UM/UIM).

Shaffer v. Continental Casualty Co., No. 06-2235 (C.D. Cal.) (long term care insurance).

Sherrill v. Progressive Northwestern Ins. Co., No. DV-03-220 (18th D. Ct. Mont.) (automotive premiums).

Soto v. Progressive Mountain Ins. Co., No. 2002-CV-47 (Dist. Ct. Mont.) (personal injury insurance).

Webb v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., No. CV-2007-418-3 (Cir. Ct. Ark) (bodily injury claims).

Securities

In re Municipal Derivatives Antitrust Litig., MDL No. 1950 (S.D.N.Y.).

In re Mutual Funds Inv. Litig., MDL No. 1586 (D. Md.) (Allianz Sub-Track).



Canada

Bechard v. Province of Ontario, No. CV-10-417343 (Ont. S.C.J.) (personal injury).

Clarke v. Province of Ontario, No. CV-10-411911 (Ont. S.C.J.) (personal injury).

Dolmage v. Province of Ontario, No. CV-09-376927CP00 (Ont. S.C.J.) (personal injury).

Donnelly v. United Technologies Corp., No. 06-CV-320045 CP (Ont. S.C.J.) (defective product).

Hall v. Gillette Canada Co., No. 47521CP (Ont. S.C.J.) (false advertising).

Wener v. United Technologies Corp., 2008 QCCS 6605 (Québec) (defective product).

Articles and Presentations

Shannon Wheatman & Alicia Gehring, *Mixed Media: A Smarter Approach To Class Action Notice*, Law360.com (June 11, 2015).

Shannon Wheatman, Speaker, *Balancing Due Process and Claims: A Conversation on Strategies to Safeguard Your Settlement*, Plaintiffs' Forum, Rancho Palos Verdes, CA (Apr. 2015).

Joshua Davis, Shannon Wheatman & Cristen Stephansky, *Writing Better Jury Instructions: Antitrust as an Example*, Paper presented at 15th Annual Loyola Antitrust Colloquium, Chicago, IL (Apr. 2015).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Speaker, *Can Competition Concepts be Made Comprehensible to Juries (and Judges)*, American Antitrust Institute's Business Behavior & Competition Policy in the Courtroom: Current Challenges for Judges, Stanford, CA (Aug. 2014).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Webinar Speaker, *Crafting Class Settlement Notice Programs: Due Process, Reach, Claims Rates, and More*, Strafford Publications (Feb. 2014).

Shannon R. Wheatman, *Cutting Through the Clutter: Eight Tips for Creatively Engaging Class Members and Increasing Response*, CLASS ACTION LITIGATION REPORT, 15 CLASS 88 (Jan. 24, 2014).

Shannon Wheatman & Michelle Ghiselli, *Privacy Policies: How To Communicate Effectively with Consumers*, International Association of Privacy Professionals (2014).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Speaker, *Report on Model Jury Instructions in Civil Antitrust Cases, Presentation*, American Antitrust Institute's 7th Annual Private Antitrust Enforcement Conference, Washington, DC (Dec. 2013).



Shannon R. Wheatman, Speaker, *Class Action Notice*, Reach & Administration, CLE International's 9th Annual Class Action Conference, Washington, DC (Oct. 2013).

Shannon R. Wheatman, *Ensuring Procedural Fairness Through Effective Notice*, in NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CLASS ACTIONS: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN QUÉBEC, IN CANADA AND IN THE UNITED STATES 83-99 (Yvon Blais ed., 2013).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Speaker, *Class Action Developments and Settlements*, 18th Annual Consumer Financial Services Institute, New York, New York (Apr. 2013).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Speaker, *Recent Trends in Class Actions in the United States*, National Conference on Class Actions: Recent Developments in Québec, in Canada and in the United States, Montreal, Canada (Mar. 2013).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Speaker, *Report on Model Jury Instructions in Civil Antitrust Cases, Presentation*, American Antitrust Institute's 6th Annual Private Antitrust Enforcement Conference, Washington, DC (Dec. 2012).

Shannon R. Wheatman & Katherine M. Kinsella, *International Class Action Notice*, in WORLD CLASS ACTION: A GUIDE TO GROUP AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTIONS AROUND THE GLOBE 673-686 (Paul Karlsgodt ed., 2012).

Katherine Kinsella & Shannon Wheatman, *Class Notice and Claims Administration*, in PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT OF ANTITRUST LAW IN THE UNITED STATES: A HANDBOOK 338-348 (Albert A. Foer & Randy M. Stutz eds., 2012).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Webinar Speaker, *Class Action Notice Requirements: Challenges for Plaintiffs and Defendants*, Strafford Publications (July 2012).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Webinar Speaker, *How to Craft Plain Language Privacy Notices*, Int'l Assoc. of Privacy Professionals (Oct. 2011).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Speaker, *Improving Take-Up Rates in Class Actions*, The Canadian Institute's 12th Annual National Forum on Class Actions, Ontario, Canada (Sept. 2011).

Shannon R. Wheatman & Terri R. LeClercq, *Majority of Publication Class Action Notices Fail to Satisfy Rule 23 Requirements*, 30 REV. LITIG. 53 (2011).



Shannon R. Wheatman & Terri R. LeClercq, *Majority of Publication Class Action Notices Fail to Satisfy Rule 23 Requirements*, CLASS ACTION LITIGATION REPORT, 12 CLASS 560, (June 24, 2011).

Katherine Kinsella & Shannon Wheatman, *Class Notice and Claims Administration*, in THE INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT OF COMPETITION LAW 264–274 (Albert A. Foer & Jonathan W. Cuneo eds., 2010).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Speaker, *Majority of Publication Class Action Notices Fail to Satisfy Plain Language Requirements*, Clarity International Conference, Lisbon, Portugal (Oct. 2010).

Shannon R. Wheatman, Webinar Speaker, *Class Action Notification With Electronic Media: Emerging Legal Issues*, Stratford Publications (Sept. 2010).

Shannon R. Wheatman & Thomas E. Willging, *Does Attorney Choice of Forum in Class Action Litigation Really Make a Difference?* 17 CLASS ACTIONS & DERIVATIVES SUITS 1 (2007).

Todd B. Hilsee, Gina M. Intrepido & Shannon R. Wheatman, *Hurricanes, Mobility and Due Process: The “Desire-to-Inform” Requirement for Effective Class Action Notice Is Highlighted by Katrina*, 80 TULANE LAW REV. 1771 (2006).

Thomas E. Willging & Shannon R. Wheatman, *Attorney Choice of Forum in Class Action Litigation: What Difference Does it Make?* NOTRE DAME L. REV., 81 (2), 101, 161 (2006).

Todd B. Hilsee, Shannon R. Wheatman & Gina M. Intrepido, *Do you really want me to know my rights? The ethics behind due process in class action notice is more than just plain language: A desire to actually inform*. GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS, 18 (4), 1359-1382 (2005).

Thomas E. Willging & Shannon R. Wheatman, *An Empirical Examination of Attorneys’ Choice of Forum in Class Action Litigation*. FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER (2005).

Elizabeth C. Wiggins & Shannon R. Wheatman, *So what’s a concerned psychologist to do? Translating the research on interrogations, confessions, and entrapment into policy*, in INTERROGATIONS, CONFESSIONS AND ENTRAPMENT 265–280 (G. Daniel Lassiter ed., 2004).

Thomas E. Willging & Shannon R. Wheatman, *Attorneys’ Experiences and Perceptions of Class Action Litigation in Federal and State Courts. A Report to the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules Regarding a Case Based Survey*. FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER (2003).



Shannon R. Wheatman, *Survey of Bankruptcy Judges on Effectiveness of Case-Weights*. FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER (2003).

Elizabeth C. Wiggins & Shannon R. Wheatman, *Judicial Evaluation of Bankruptcy Judges*. FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER (2003).

Robert Niemic, Thomas Willging, & Shannon Wheatman, *Effects of Amchem/Ortiz on Filing of Federal Class Actions: Report to the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules*. FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER (2002).

Shannon Wheatman, Robert Niemic & Thomas Willging, *Report to the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules: Class Action Notices*. FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER (2002).

Elizabeth C. Wiggins & Shannon R. Wheatman, *Implementation of Selected Amendments to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 by United States Bankruptcy Courts*. FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER (2001).

Shannon R. Wheatman & David R. Shaffer, *On finding for defendants who plead insanity: The crucial impact of dispositional instructions and opportunity to deliberate*. LAW & HUM. BEH., 25(2), 165, 181 (2001).

Shannon R. Wheatman, *Distance Learning in the Courts*. FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER (2000).

David R. Shaffer & Shannon R. Wheatman, *Does personality influence the effectiveness of judicial instructions?* PSYCHOL. PUB. POL'Y & L., 6, 655, 676 (2000).

Court Testimony

State v. Farmer Group Inc., No. D-1-GV-02-002501 (D. Ct. Tex., Travis County).

Scharfstein v. BP West Coast Products, LLC, No. 1112-17046 (Cir. Ct. Ore.).

Spillman v. Domino's Pizza, No. 10-349 (M.D. La.)

PRC Holdings LLC v. East Resources, Inc., No. 06-C-81 (Cir. Ct. W. Va.).

Guidry v. Am. Public Life Ins. Co., No. 2008-3465 (14th Jud. Dist. Ct., Calcasieu Parish).

Webb v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., No. CV-2007-418-3 (Cir. Ct. Ark).

Beasley v. The Reliable Life Ins. Co., No. CV-2005-58-1 (Cir. Ct. Ark).



Depositions

Hale v. CNX Gas Co., LLC, No. 10-CV-59 (W.D. Va.).

Thomas v. A. Wilbert Sons, LLC, No. 55,127 (18th Jud. Dist. Ct., Iberville Parish).

Judicial Comments

In re Transpacific Passenger Air Trans. Antitrust Litig., MDL No. 1913 (N.D. Cal.)

In overruling an objection that direct notice should have been done, the Court found “[T]he notice program, which the Court already approved, reached 80.3% of the potential class members in the United States an average of 2.6 times and “at least 70%” of members of the Settlement Classes living in Japan. See Mot. for Final Approval at 4; Wheatman Decl. ¶¶ 8, 18. The notice also included paid media in 13 other countries. *Id.*; ¶ 25. There were 700,961 unique visits to the website, toll-free numbers in 15 countries received over 2,693 calls, and 1,015 packages were mailed to potential class members. *Id.* ¶¶ 6, 9, 10. It was therefore adequate.” – Hon. Charles R. Breyer (2015)

In re Target Corp. Customer Data Security Breach Litig., MDL No. 14-2522 (D. Minn.)

“The parties accomplished notice here through direct notice, paid and earned media, and an informational website... [T]he notice program reached 83% of potential class members. The notice here comports with Rule 23(e)... Class notice reached more than 80 million people, with direct notice sent to 61 million consumers... [The] infinitesimally small amount of opposition weighs in favor of approving the settlement.” – Hon. Paul A. Magnuson (2015)

In re Sony Gaming Networks & Customer Data Security Breach Litig., No. 11-MD-2258 (S.D. Cal.)

“The form, content, and method of dissemination of the notice given to the Settlement Class were adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the proposed settlement, the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and these proceedings to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process.” – Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia (2015)

The Shane Grp., Inc., v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, No. 2:10-CV-14360 (D. Minn.)

“The notice to Settlement Class Members consisted of postcard notices to millions of potential class members, as well as advertisements in newspapers and newspaper supplements, in People magazine, and on the Internet... The Court finds that this notice...was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice; and . . . fully complied with due process principles and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.” – Hon. Denise Page Hood (2015)



Mirakay v. Dakota Growers Pasta Co., Inc., No. 13-CV-4229 (D. N.J.)

"Having heard the objections made, the Court is unimpressed with the Objectors argument that there was somehow insufficient notice . . . This notice program has fully informed members of their rights and benefits under the settlement, and all required information has been fully and clearly presented to class members. Accordingly, this widespread and comprehensive campaign provides sufficient notice under the circumstances, satisfying both due process and Rule 23 and the settlement is therefore approved by this Court." – Hon. Joel A. Pisano (2014)

In re Dynamic Random Memory Antitrust Litig., MDL No. 1486 (N.D. Cal.)

"The Court confirms its prior findings that the Notices given pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order were the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Court further confirms its prior findings that said notices provided due, adequate, and sufficient notice of these proceedings and of the matters set forth herein, including the proposed settlements set forth in the Settlement Agreements, and that said notice fully satisfied the requirements of due process, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and all applicable state laws." – Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton (2014)

Trammell v. Barbara's Bakery, Inc., No. 12-CV-02664 (N.D. Cal.)

"The Class Notice, the Summary Settlement Notice, the website, the toll-free telephone number, all other notices in the Settlement Agreement, the Declaration of the Notice Administrator, and the notice methodology implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement: (a) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action, the terms of the settlement, and their rights under the settlement, including, but not limited to, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed settlement and to appear at the Fairness Hearing; (c) were reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (d) met all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U.S.C. §1715, and the Due Process Clause(s) of the United States Constitution, as well as complied with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices." – Hon. Charles R. Breyer (2013)

Spillman v. Dominos Pizza, LLC., No. 10-349 (M.D. La.)

"At the fairness hearing notice expert Wheatman gave extensive testimony about the design and drafting of the notice plan and its implementation, the primary goal of which was to satisfy due process under the applicable legal standards...Wheatman, who has extensive experience developing plain-language jury instructions, class action notices and rules of procedure, testified that the notice was composed at a ninth grade reading level because many adults read below a high school level." – Hon. Stephen C. Riedlinger (2013)



In re Metoprolol Succinate End-Payor Antitrust Litig., No. 06-CV-71 (D. Del.)

“In accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, notice of the proposed Settlement and Plan of Allocation has been provided to the Class in the manner directed by the Court. See Wheatman Dec. Such notice to members of the Class is hereby determined to be fully in compliance with requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) and due process of law and is found to be the best notice practicable under the circumstances and to constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.” – Hon. Mary Pat Thyng (2013)

PRC Holdings, LLC v. East Resources, Inc., No. 06-CV-81(E) (W.Va. Cir. Ct., Roane County)

“Notice was uniquely effective in this action because East's records of their leases allowed the Claims Administrator to provide individual notice by mail to most Class Members.” - Hon. Thomas C. Evans, III (2012)

Kramer v. B2Mobile, LLC, No. 10-CV-02722 (N.D. Cal.)

“The Court approved Notice Plan to the Settlement Classes . . . was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including comprehensive nationwide newspaper and magazine publication, website publication, and extensive online advertising. The Notice Plan has been successfully implemented and satisfies the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and Due Process.” - Hon. Claudia A. Wilken (2012)

Cather v. Seneca-Upshur Petroleum, Inc., No. 1:09-CV-00139 (N.D. W. Va.)

“The Court finds that Class Members have been accorded the best notice as is practical under the circumstances, and have had the opportunity to receive and/or access information relating to this Settlement by reading the comprehensive written notice mailed to them . . . or by reading the published Notice in the local newspapers . . . The Court further finds that the Notice provided to the members of the Settlement Class had been effective and has afforded such class members a reasonable opportunity to be heard at the Final Fairness Hearing and to opt-out of the subject settlement should anyone so desire.” – Hon. Irene M. Keeley (2012)

In re Checking Account Overdraft Fee Litig., No. 1:09-MD-2036 (S.D. Fla.) (JP Morgan Settlement)

“The Court finds that the Settlement Class Members were provided with the best practicable notice; the notice was “reasonably calculated, under [the] circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.” *Shutts*, 472 U.S. at 812 (quoting *Mullane*, 339 U.S. at 314-15). This Settlement with Chase was widely publicized, and any Settlement Class Member who wished to express comments or objections had ample opportunity and means to do so.” - Hon. James Lawrence King (2012)



In re Netflix Privacy Litig., No. 5:11-CV-00379 (N.D. Cal.)

“The Notice Plan and the intent of the forms of Notice to the Settlement Class as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and Exhibits B through E to the Wheatman Declaration are approved pursuant to subsections (c)(2)(B) and (ed) of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.” - Hon. Edward J. Davila (2012)

Purdy v. MGA Ins. Co., No. D412-CV-2012-298 (N.M. 4th Jud. Dist. Ct.)

“Notice of the Settlement Class was constitutionally adequate, both in terms of its substance and the manner in which it was disseminated. The Notice contained the essential elements necessary to satisfy due process . . . [T]he Notice also contained a clear and concise Claim Form, and a described a clear deadline and procedure for filing of Claims. Notice was directly mailed to all Class Members whose current whereabouts could be identified by reasonable effort. Notice reached a large majority of the Class Members. The Court finds that such notice constitutes the best notice practicable.” – Hon. Eugenio Mathis (2012)

Blessing v. Sirius XM Radio Inc., No 09-CV-10035 HB (S.D.N.Y.)

“The Court finds that the distribution of the Notice and the publication of the Publication Notice . . . constituted the best notice reasonably practicable under the circumstances . . . was reasonably calculated . . . constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Class members who could be identified with reasonable efforts; and . . . satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, R 23.1 of the Local Civil Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, and all other applicable law and rules.” - Honorable Harold Baer, Jr. (2011)

Fogel v. Farmers Grp., Inc., No. BC300142 (Super. Ct. Cal.)

“The Court further finds and confirms that the Individual Notice (including the Proof of Claim), the Summary Notice, the reminder postcard, and the notice methodology: (a) constituted the best practicable notice . . . ; (b) constituted noticed that was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise potential Class Members . . . ; (c) were reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice, and (d) met all applicable requirements of California law” - Hon. Laura Evans (2011)

In re Enfamil LIPIL Mktg. & Sales Practs. Litig., No. 11-MD-02222 (S.D. Fla.)

“The Court finds that the Class Notice provided to Class Members, in the form and manner of distribution described above, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfies the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23, the requirements of due process, and any other applicable law. The declarations filed with the Court demonstrate that the Parties have



fully complied with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order (as amended by Order dated April 1, 2011) and that the best notice practicable under the circumstances was in fact given to Class Members.” - Hon. James I. Cohn (2011)

Keilholtz v. Lennox Hearth Prods., No. 08-CV-00836 (N.D. Cal.)

“Notice has been provided to the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Actions, the conditional certification of the Settlement Class for purposes of this Settlement, and the preliminary approval of the Settlement Agreement and the Settlement contemplated thereby. The Court finds that said notice and the related Notice Plan provided for the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all Persons entitled to such notice and fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.” - Hon. Claudia Wilken (2011)

Rowe v. UniCare Life and Health Ins. Co., No. 09-CV-02286 (N.D.Ill.)

“The form, content, and method of dissemination of the notice given to the Settlement Class were adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the proposed settlement, the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and these proceedings to all Persons entitled such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process.” – Hon. William J. Hibbler (2011)

Thomas v. A. Wilbert & Sons, LLC, No. 55,127 (La. 18th Jud. Dist. Ct., Iberville Parish)

“[N]otices complied with all requirements of the federal and state constitutions, including the due process clauses, and applicable articles of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to all potential members of the Thomas Subclass.” – Hon. Jerome M. Winsberg (2011)

In re M3Power Razor System Mktg. & Sales Pract. Litig., MDL No. 1704 (D. Mass)

“The form, content, and method of dissemination of the notice given to the Settlement Class was adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the proposed settlement, the terms and conditions set forth in the Amended Settlement Agreement, and these proceedings to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process.” - Hon. Douglas P. Woodlock (2011)

Soto v. Progressive Mountain Ins. Co., No. 2002-CV-47 (Dist. Ct. Colo.)

“Notice of the Settlement Class was constitutionally adequate, both in terms of its substance and the manner in which it was disseminated. The Notice contained the essential elements necessary to satisfy due process . . . Finally, the Notice also contained a clear and concise Claim Form, and described a clear



deadline and procedure for filing of claims. . . . Notice reached a large majority of the Class Members. The Court finds that such notice constitutes the best notice practicable.” - Hon. J. Steven Patrick (2010)

Press v. Louisiana Citizens Fair Plan Prop. Ins. Co., No. 06-5530 (Civ. Dist. Ct., Orleans Parish)

“This notice methodology . . . constitutes reasonable and best practicable notice . . . constitutes due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and . . . meets the requirements of the United States Constitution, Louisiana law, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and any other applicable rules of the Court . . .” - Hon. Sidney H. Cates, IV (2010)

In re Katrina Canal Breaches, No. 05-4182 (E.D. La.)

“The notice here was crafted by Shannon Wheatman, Ph.D., whose affidavit was received as evidence. . . . The entire notice was drafted in plain, comprehensible language The Court finds this notice adequately reached the potential class.” - Hon. Stanwood R. DuVal, Jr. (2009)

Jones v. Dominion Transmission Inc., No. 2.06-CV-00671 (S.D. W. Va.)

“The Parties’ notice expert Shannon R. Wheatman, Ph.D. . . . testified that in this case . . . that the mailed notices reached approximately 95.4 percent of the potential class . . . I HOLD that personal jurisdiction exists over the Class Members because notice was reasonable and afforded the Settlement Class an opportunity to be heard and to opt out.” - Hon. Joseph R. Goodwin (2009)

Guidry v. Am. Public Life Ins. Co., No. 2008-3465 (14th Jud. Dist. Ct.)

“The facts show that the notice plan . . . as adequate to design and implementation . . . Dr. Shannon R. Wheatman, a notice expert, also testified at the fairness hearing as to the sufficiency of the notice plan. Dr. Wheatman testified that the notice form, content, and dissemination was adequate and reasonable, and was the best notice practicable.” - Hon. G. Michael Canaday (2008)

Webb v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., (March 3, 2008) No. CV-2007-418-3 (Cir. Ct. Ark)

“Ms. Wheatman’s presentation today was very concise and straight to the point . . . that’s the way the notices were . . . So, I appreciate that . . . Having admitted and reviewed the Affidavit of Shannon Wheatman and her testimony concerning the success of the notice campaign, including the fact that written notice reached 92.5% of the potential Class members, the Court finds that it is unnecessary to afford a new opportunity to request exclusion to individual Class members who had an earlier opportunity to request exclusion but failed to do so The Court finds that there was minimal opposition to the settlement. After undertaking an extensive notice campaign to Class members of approximately 10,707 persons, mailed notice reached 92.5% of potential Class members.” - Hon. Kirk D. Johnson (2008)



Sherrill v. Progressive Northwestern Ins. Co., No. DV-03-220 (18th D. Ct. Mont.)

“Dr. Wheatman’s affidavit was very informative, and very educational, and very complete and thorough about the process that was undertaken here. . . So I have reviewed all of these documents and the affidavit of Dr. Wheatman and based upon the information that is provided . . . and the significant number of persons who are contacted here, 90 percent, the Court will issue the order.” - Hon. Mike Salvagni (2008)

Shaffer v. Continental Casualty Co., No. 06-2235 (C.D. Cal.)

“The Class Notice and the notice methodology implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, as described in part in the Declarations of . . . Shannon Wheatman . . . constituted the best practicable notice. . . was reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Class Action Fairness Act, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clauses), the Rules of the Court, and any other applicable law.” - Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez (2008)

Gray’s Harbor v. Carrier Corp., No. 05-05437 (W.D. Wash.)

“The Court finds that this notice was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, that it provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, and that it fully satisfied all applicable requirements of law and due process.” - Hon. Ronald B. Leighton (2008)

Beringer v. Certegy Check Servs., Inc., No. 8:07-CV-1434-T-23TGW (M.D. Fla.)

“The proposed form of notice and plan for publishing are reasonable and designed to advise members of the Settlement class of their rights . . . A nationally recognized notice specialist, Hilsoft Notifications, has developed the comprehensive Notice Plan. Here, Notice is reasonably calculated to reach the maximum number of potential Settlement Class Members and, thus, qualifies as the best notice practicable. The Notice Plan here is designed to reach the maximum number of Class Members, and it is Plaintiffs’ goal to reach at least 80% of the Class—an extraordinary result in consumer class action litigation.” - Hon. Steven D. Merryday (2008)

Palace v. DaimlerChrysler Corp., No. 01-CH-13168 (Cir. Ct. Ill.)

“The form, content, and method of dissemination of the notice given to the Illinois class and to the Illinois Settlement Class were adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the proposed Settlement, the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and these proceedings, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of due process . . .” -Hon. Mary Anne Mason (2008)



Johnson v. Progressive Casualty Ins., Co., No. CV-2003-513 (Cir. Ct. Ark.)

“Notice of the Settlement Class was constitutionally adequate, both in terms of its substance and the manner in which it was disseminated . . . Notice was direct mailed to all Class members whose current whereabouts could be identified by reasonable effort. Notice reached a large majority of the Class members. The Court finds that such notice constitutes the best notice practicable . . . The forms of Notice and Notice Plan satisfy all of the requirements of Arkansas law and due process.” - Hon. Carol Crafton Anthony (2007)

Beasley v. The Reliable Life Ins. Co., No. CV-2005-58-1 (Cir. Ct. Ark)

“[T]he Court has, pursuant to the testimony regarding the notification requirements, that were specified and adopted by this Court, has been satisfied and that they meet the requirements of due process. They are fair, reasonable, and adequate. I think the method of notification certainly meets the requirements of due process . . . So the Court finds that the notification that was used for making the potential class members aware of this litigation and the method of filing their claims, if they chose to do so, all those are clear and concise and meet the plain language requirements and those are completely satisfied as far as this Court is concerned in this matter.” - Hon. Joe Griffin (2007)

Education and Experience

Education

Ph.D., Social Psychology, 2001; The University of Georgia, Athens, GA

Dissertation Title: *The effects of plain language drafting on layperson's comprehension of class action notices.*

M.S., Social Psychology, 1999; The University of Georgia, Athens, GA

Thesis Title: *Effects of verdict choice, dispositional instructions, opportunity to deliberate, and locus of control on juror decisions in an insanity case.*

M.L.S., Legal Studies, 1996; The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE

B.A., Psychology, 1993; Millersville University of Pennsylvania, Millersville, PA

Honor's Thesis Title: *The effects of inadmissible evidence and judicial admonishment in individual versus group decisions in a mock jury simulation.*



Related Experience

Hilsoft Notifications
Souderton, PA
2004-2009

Dr. Wheatman was the Vice President (2006-2009) and Notice Director (2004-2009) at Hilsoft Notifications, a legal notification firm.

Federal Judicial Center
Washington, DC
2000-2004

Dr. Wheatman was a Research Associate at the Federal Judicial Center. The Federal Judicial Center is the education and research agency for the Federal Courts. The Research Division performs empirical and explanatory research on federal judicial processes and court management. Dr. Wheatman worked with the Civil Rules Advisory Committee on a number of class action studies and with the Bankruptcy Administration Committee on judicial evaluations.

Supplementary Background

Dr. Wheatman has a strong statistical background, having completed nine graduate level courses as well as teaching undergraduate statistics at the University of Georgia.

